

## REMARKS

Claims 7, 19-24, 30, 32 and 34-71 are pending in the present Application.

Reconsideration and allowance of the entire case is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

### Right of Priority

Applicants are submitting herewith a Certified English Translation of the priority document, Japanese Patent Application No. 2001-287328 with a filing date of September 28, 2000. Accordingly, Applicants can antedate U.S. Patent No. 6,811,808 to Oshshita et al.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7, 32, 35-43, 51-53, 55, 57, 58, 62-63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,255,755 to Ikuko et al. ("Ikuko") in combination with U.S. Patent No. 6,811,808 to Oshshita et al. ("Oshshita").

This rejection is moot. Oshshita can now be removed as prior art, since Applicants have submitted a Certified English translation of their priority document.

Applicants claim priority to their Japanese Patent Application No. 2001-287328 having filing date of September 28, 2000. Oshshita has a 35 U.S.C. 102(e) date of February 22, 2001. As such, Oshshita cannot be considered as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

With Oshshita removed, the only remaining reference is Ikuko, which as admitted by the Examiner, does "not teach the same material in first positional relationship and second positional relationship by changing the [r]elative positions of the material source and mask and substrate". (O.A., page 3). Therefore, the presently claimed invention cannot be viewed as obvious from Ikuko and is therefore allowable.

### Claims 51 and 68

Although Claim 51 is not listed as an allowable claim, Claim 51 depends from allowable Claim 44, and therefore should be allowed.

In addition, although Claim 68 is still pending, Claim 68 is neither marked allowable nor rejected. However, for at least the reasons given above, Claim 68 would be allowable

even if the Examiner rejected Claim 68.

#### Information Disclosure Statements

Applicants filed an information disclosure statement on November 23, 2004. While the Examiner has returned a signed PTO-1449 form for this submission, the Examiner has not initialed as having considered each reference cited therein. More particularly, in the "Other Documents" section, the Examiner did not initial the "Office Action for Korean Patent Application No. 10-2001-0059939".

Applicants again filed an information disclosure statement on March 28, 2005. Again, the Examiner returned a signed PTO-1449 form for this submission with one reference not initialed. More particularly, the Examiner did not initial the "Office Action for Chinese Patent Application No. 011436867".

Applicants filed an information disclosure statement on September 28, 2005. Again, the Examiner returned a signed PTO-1449 form for this submission with one reference not initialed. More particularly, the Examiner did not initial "JP2000068053".

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner return signed and initialed copies of the corresponding PTO-1449 forms for these IDS submissions

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By 

Joel T. Charlton

Registration No. 52,721

Date: April 24, 2006  
Telephone (404) 607-9991  
Facsimile (404) 607-9981  
Customer No.: 23413